

Soviet Union has uncovered a new way to harass Jews—the Kremlin now denies Orthodox Jews the right to be buried in consecrated cemeteries. This is a basic right which was never denied Jews even in the darkest periods of the Middle Ages.

This latest Soviet action marks continuation of the Soviet Union's drive against Jews, and it calls for renewed protests by religious organizations and leading citizens throughout the world. At a time when the Soviet Union says it is seeking to relieve the tensions of the cold war, it should be made aware that world public opinion condemns unequivocally a course of action as vicious and unreasoning as this deliberate indignity to a people because of their religion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the news report headline "Jews Denied Cemeteries in Moscow," which appeared in the Washington Post, September 16.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### Jews Denied Cemeteries in Moscow

Moscow, August 15.—A new kind of spiritual setback has developed for the religious Jews of Moscow.

For the first time in memory, Jews who die here are being denied burial in the consecrated ground of a Jewish cemetery. Instead they are buried now in a general civil cemetery, among atheists and non-Jews.

For Orthodox Jews, for whom burial in a Jewish cemetery is an ancient religious mandate, new municipal regulations come as a crushing development in deteriorating relations with the Communist regime. Jewish scholars have long regarded consecrated burial as basic, and even the millions of Jews slaughtered during World War II were symbolically reburied in Jewish cemeteries.

All attempts by the Jewish community in Moscow to reverse the new measures have been rejected by Soviet authorities, well-informed sources said Thursday.

The current situation developed when Moscow's 40-year old Jewish cemetery began filling to capacity and Soviet officials refused to set aside additional land for a distinctly Jewish burial place.

#### ECONOMIC FACTORS VITAL ELEMENT IN NEGRO DISCONTENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the recent hearings before the Manpower Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am a member, highly significant testimony was presented by Mr. Herman P. Miller, of the Census Bureau, about the deepest sources of Negro discontent. An article in the New York Times of August 18, 1963, describes Mr. Miller's testimony and concludes:

The Negro revolt has many causes, but its basic power is that of the force of economic wretchedness.

The Census Bureau testimony fully supports this thesis and, as the article points out:

Disputes the widespread impression that the relative position of the Negro in the affluent society has improved in recent years.

I ask unanimous consent that the Times article be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1963] **ECONOMIC FACTORS UNDERLIE NEGRO DISCONTENT—ELIMINATION OF JOBS THROUGH AUTOMATION IS SHARPENING PROBLEM OF EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST NONWHITE WORKERS**

(By John D. Pomfret)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—The United States is undergoing two internal revolutions. One is the Negro revolt. The other is technological. It is not coincidental that they have arrived together.

The Negro revolt has many causes, but its basic power is that of the force of economic wretchedness. It is this wretchedness that technological change is threatening to exacerbate beyond endurance by automating out of existence many of the unskilled and skilled jobs Negroes hold.

That the Negro community is in the throes of profound economic crisis is evident from the unemployment figures.

Making up less than 10 percent of the country's labor force, Negroes account for 20 percent of its unemployment. Nearly a quarter of those out of work for more than half a year are Negroes.

In July—the most recent month for which comparable figures are available—the jobless rate among white workers was 5.1 percent; among Negroes it was 11.2 percent.

Unemployment of those proportions, were it general, would be a national catastrophe.

The economic vulnerability of Negroes is inherent in their employment pattern. In turn, that pattern is the product of years of discrimination, not only in employment, but also in education, training, and referral to jobs.

#### POSITION VULNERABLE

For the most part, Negroes hold low-paid jobs. Where they do hold reasonably well paid jobs in industry, they occupy mostly positions that are routine and repetitive and, consequently, lend themselves to being taken over by machines.

Nearly 15 percent of all employed Negroes still work on farms. Only 5 percent of all white workers do. Nearly 15 percent of the employed Negroes work in private households, but only 2 percent of the white workers do.

Only 2 percent of all Negro workers are technicians, while 8 percent of the white workers are in these rapidly-expanding occupations. Only 7 percent of the Negroes are clerks, compared to 16 percent of the whites, and so on.

The evidence is mounting that the situation of Negroes in relation to whites has been steadily deteriorating.

A recent Labor Department study showed that in the years right after World War II the Negro unemployment rate averaged about 60 percent above the white rate. But since 1954 it has been consistently twice as high.

A study by Herman P. Miller of the Census Bureau, issued this month, brought the Negro dilemma sharply into focus.

Mr. Miller disputes the widespread impression that the relative position of the Negro in the affluent society has improved in recent years. In relation to whites, he argues, the Negro's position has not improved for two decades.

#### MOBILITY HELPFUL

While it is true, Mr. Miller says, that Negroes have raised their occupational levels faster than whites, this has been because they have moved from the rural South to the urban industrial North, not because of any major improvements in job opportunities.

Mr. Miller puts it this way:

"There has been a general upgrading of occupational skills for both whites and Negroes as the American economy has moved away from agriculture and become more complex and industrialized. As a result, Negroes, who were once highly concentrated in sharecropping and farm labor, have now moved up to unskilled and semiskilled factory jobs; some have moved into white-collar employment. But there has been a parallel upgrading of jobs held by whites.

The real question is whether the relative upward movement has been faster for non-whites than for whites. In most States the nonwhite male now has about the same occupational distribution relative to whites that he had in 1940 and 1950."

Other measures bear out the point. The income gap between whites and Negroes narrowed during World War II because of war-induced shortages of unskilled labor, Mr. Miller found. In the last decade, however, there has been no change in income differential between the two groups. The median pay of the Negro worker has remained stuck at about 85 percent of the white.

The disparity is further illustrated. Negroes who have not gone beyond eighth grade have little chance of becoming anything higher up the occupational ladder than a porter, a laborer, or an assembly line worker.

Negro college graduates at first glance seem to do much better. Three in four were professional or managerial workers—nearly the same proportion as among white college graduates. But the appearance of equality is illusory. The Negroes were concentrated in lower paid jobs.

In terms of income, Mr. Miller found that this boiled down to the fact that the average Negro college graduate could expect to earn less over his lifetime than the white who did not go beyond eighth grade.

The obvious answer to the Negro dilemma is deceptively simple. Open up jobs to Negroes and equip Negroes to fill them.

The first hard fact, however, is that there are not enough jobs to go around. The economy has been producing jobs at a lagging rate. Unemployment has been stuck at well above 5 percent of the work force for more than 5 years and shows no signs of sinking to more tolerable levels soon.

So the Negro's fight is bound inextricably to improving the economy's general performance and this does not seem to be happening very fast.

#### INCENTIVE LACKING

The educational level of Negroes is still far lower than whites and the gap is not shrinking.

Because of the straitened circumstances of their families, many Negro children have to leave school early. This perpetuates the vicious circle.

To attack these problems, Negro leaders are urging enactment of enforceable Federal fair employment practices legislation. Not only should this open up jobs, but it should provide Negro children with the hope necessary to sustain their motivation, the leaders contend.

#### CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL

There is not much expectation that such legislation will pass Congress this year.

The administration has recommended an increase in Federal aid to vocational education and in the Federal manpower retraining program. But there is grave doubt among many familiar with the problem whether these measures, if enacted, will make much of a dent.

To redeem large masses of unskilled, uneducated workers who have become virtually unemployed and to prevent hundreds of thousands of children from poor families from falling prey to the same ills is going to take far more work and money than the country has grasped, many Negro leaders believe.

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

723

very dear friends whom we respect so deeply that we speak so frankly.

Thus, our course of action, as the leaders of the Atlantic alliance, is not a churlish retreat into reciprocal isolationism and is not a hands-off policy of hoping that the forces of reason win out. It is, rather, an unequivocal acceptance of our responsibility and expectation that others will accept theirs.

President de Gaulle seems to conceive of the United States as a shield—strong enough still to deter Communist aggression, and useful in protecting the continental Western European nations, but only while they carry through their own policies, whatever those policies may be, without the necessary regard for their effect on us or the rest of the free world.

President de Gaulle could build a new continental European provincialism on the strong foundation of economic power which is being established by the European Economic Community—thereby taking us back some decades. If the European Economic Community were persuaded to go through with actions intended to make their nations the core of a so-called third force in world politics, that would gravely strain the bonds of unity which since 1947 have enabled the free world to resist Communist aggression. The danger is real and imminent.

We cannot let the situation get away from us, because the consequences are too grave for the United States and the free world—and for France itself.

This new danger was foreseen by many, like myself, who strongly favored and supported the movement for European economic and political integration which has resulted in the creation of the European Economic Community. We were and are right, for the added strength to the free world brought by the European Economic Community was worth the risk; but this does not erase the need to fight the danger now. It must be met by policies which will lead to the successful entry of the United Kingdom and its European trading partners of the EFTA, or as many as possible.

But a decision must be made to apply our strength, rather than to stand transfixed by the quixotic spectacle being enacted in Paris. I may point out that if we were to proceed along that line—although I hope and pray we do not have to—we have powerful assets.

There is little doubt that the devious elements which are pulling dangerously at the fabric of Atlantic unity have gained strength over the past year. Memories of past grandeur and revived suspicions and prejudices in Europe have taken on substance, and could pose new dangers to the cause of freedom.

The United States cannot by moral action instill what we would consider to be political maturity in the leaders of foreign nations with histories older than the discovery of America and with experiences so tragic and so off-repeated that words of advice should be necessary—and are, in fact, vain. The well-known requirements of our own safety would make futile the threat to withdraw the protective umbrella of our

military might, under the assured safety of which our friends are considering dangerous games.

But we can, and must, stand ready to strengthen Great Britain's bargaining power with the EEC. I suggest that the means for doing so reside in our ability to negotiate on money, trade, and economics with Britain and her industrialized Commonwealth and European partners in a broad scale way. Even now the United Kingdom is our third best customer; and, although 16 percent of its total trade is with the EEC, 10 percent is still with us. We are leading customers for British machinery and transport equipment, leather and wool textile manufactures, and, of course, Scotch whisky. Britain, in turn, is among the top European purchasers of our machinery, chemicals, grain products, fats and oils, nonferrous metals, textiles, pulp and paper, and fruits and vegetables. During 1961, Britain, combined with Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, which are also threatened with exclusion from access to the EEC, took \$5.2 billion of our exports—\$1.8 billion more than the five EEC nations combined. The basis for effective partnership exists there.

The EEC would be faced by the threat of being confronted with a trading partnership—I do not say it should be set up; I merely say it could be set up if it has to be—made up of the United States, Great Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, other European nations, Japan, and Latin America, along with other large areas of the developing world, by far more potent economically than the EEC itself. No one recognizes better than I do that such a confrontation, with its danger of mutual exclusion, would be damaging to the EEC and to the whole of the free world; it would endanger the alliances in a way the U.S.S.R. has sought for years—but unsuccessfully—to do.

But it is an alternative—although admittedly a deplorable one—to an even worse scattering and dilution of free world power, as now threatened. Although we would regret greatly to see such an alternative used, yet certainly it could be used if this matter were to be stretched to the extreme that President de Gaulle indicates he wishes to stretch it.

It is unfortunate indeed that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 does not contain the full powers of negotiation with Great Britain and other industrialized nations which it provides with the EEC—for it assumed that Great Britain would join the EEC. This is a shortcoming of the act which the Senate attempted to correct last year—without success, mainly because of lack of support from the administration. Still, however, the residual negotiating powers in the act do give the United States the opportunity to apply its economic weight to the task of holding together the free world. I only wish to point out that a somewhat more sophisticated concept of international realities on the part of the administration last year would have made our task easier today.

Least there be further miscalculation, hesitation, and timidity, let me point out that the application of our economic strength to the cause of free world unity would find powerful support within the EEC itself. None of the partners of France in the EEC seemingly desires an isolated Community that would shut out the contributions of the United Kingdom and other European nations and would delve inward, underneath the progress of today, to find in the rubble of past wars the ephemeral stories which caused those wars. And I have little doubt that in France itself there is a great body of enlightened opinion which seeks the very goals towards which all of us must strive.

Mr. President, as an indication of the course we should follow, I should like to point out that in drafting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, we took account of the assumed fact that Britain would enter the European Economic Community, notwithstanding the arguments, which persons such as myself made, to the effect that that was a very risky assumption. It may now prove to have been very unwise. Indeed, the Senate did not decide to proceed in that way, but the other body did, and the Senate was compelled to compromise on that basis. However, the freedom of negotiation which otherwise we would have is now restricted by the assumption on which that act was based, although that assumption has now been proved to be wrong; namely, that the European Economic Community would include the United Kingdom. Therefore, the percentage figures used in connection with negotiations to waive entirely customs and duties were fixed so high, in arriving at the estimates of the production of those who participated in the negotiations, that we should not engage either with the European Economic Community or with the United Kingdom, if it were barred directly from the European Economic Community, under the present Trade Expansion Act. I point that out to my colleagues, to show that we took for granted much that is very seriously being jeopardized at this time.

Mr. President, I end on the following note: I urge a policy of Atlantic unity—boldly pursued both in military and economic matters. The backward vision of one man, no matter how great and justly admired and honored a figure he is—and I join in so saluting General de Gaulle—must not be permitted to drive the world backward, after he has contributed so greatly to moving it forward. It is for that reason that I make these recommendations.

## RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Soviet Union's continuing policy of persecuting religious and religious groups has been exemplified in recent weeks by the reports of a Russian Baptist sect seeking refuge in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, by attacks on Lithuanian Catholics, Jehovah's Witnesses, and other sects, by the reported closing of the churches in Leningrad, and the